



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

$$4.51: (5) = (p \supset q) \subset (p r \subset q r)$$

Theorem 4.56. $(p \subset q) \subset (p r \subset q r)$

Proof: Lemma 2 $\{(p \subset q)p/q\}$:

$$\{[(p \subset q)p] \supset q\} \subset \{[(p \subset q)p] r \subset q r\} \quad (1)$$

$$2.91: (1) = \{[(p \subset q)p] \supset q\} \subset \{[(p \subset q) (p r)] \subset q r\} \quad (2)$$

$$4.53: (2) \times 4.53 \supset [(p \subset q) (p r)] \subset q r \quad (3)$$

$$4.51: (3) = (p \subset q) \subset (p r \subset q r) \text{Q.E.D.}$$

Theorem 4.57. $(p \subset q) = (-q \subset -p)$

$$\textit{Proof: } 2.8, 2.51: -(p \supset q) = -[-q \supset (-p)] \quad (1)$$

$$1.03: (1) = [(p \subset q) = (-q \subset -p)] \text{Q.E.D.}$$

For similar reasons, postulate L of the set given for the "Calculus of Ordinary Inference" should be

$$L. (p q \supset r s) \supset (p o q \supset r o s).$$

C. I. LEWIS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

REVIEWS AND ABSTRACTS OF LITERATURE

Authority in the Modern State. HAROLD J. LASKI. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1919. Pp. 398.

Usually, we do not understand the institutions we take for granted, and unwittingly we obey Burke's admonition and reverence them. Such has been our attitude toward the state. Of late, when our own political philosophers discussed it, they did so nearly always to justify its existing form of organization. When our political scientists dealt with it, they seldom did more than describe and classify its organs of government.

Mr. Laski breaks with this tradition. His view of the state is heretical, although he hides his non-conformity behind an awe-inspiring mass of pointed references and excellent foot-notes. He inquires into the problem of state authority and the nature of obedience. To Mr. Laski the state is the people organized politically. He would say with William Graham Sumner "the state is all of us," but would add, "yet, not all of each of us." There are innumerable human interests which lie outside the purview of the state, which, after all, is no more than one of the innumerable group units of which society is composed. While the state and government are not identical, it is through government that the state functions, and thus, any real-

istic analysis of the modern state will actually be an analysis of government. The doctrine of sovereignty is but a legal fiction, which has, in fact, already broken down. The state is entitled to no loyalty from its members which it has not freely won from them through service. It is the co-equal rather than the superior of the other group units which go to make up society. The individual may be, and he usually is, a member of several groups. Obedience to the state, *viz.*, obedience to the persons who constitute the government, must rest ultimately upon free individual response. In a clash between the state and a non-political group the individual must be left free to choose as to which he will give his adherence. Good citizenship consists in contributing to society the best in one's personality. Yet without freedom this is impossible. The sovereign state, which lays first claim upon the loyalty of citizens, is the denial of freedom. And the claim of unquestioned obedience is most dangerous at the very times when it is most vigorously exerted—at times of crisis—for it deprives the state of free counsel at the hour of its greatest need, and takes from the individual his freedom of choice in a moment of most vital import.

But, this work tries to show, the doctrine of sovereignty has in fact broken down. The state's own civil servants have demanded the right, now freely accorded other workers, to form associations and to strike. In France, and since the author's writing in Great Britain, in Canada and in Massachusetts, civil servants, including even the police, have organized and conducted strikes against the arbitrary power of the state. Their governments have vigorously condemned them, have loudly asserted the doctrine of sovereignty and have finally yielded to their servants' demands.

The present state organization stands counter to the facts of social life. Society has become too complex, interests have grown too varied, for the "knowledge necessary to the parts and of the whole" to be concentrated "at a common center," as Tom Paine thought possible. The "new synthesis" at whose threshold Mr. Laski tells us we stand, will be a federalistic society, functionally as well as territorially. The function of production will be separated as completely as possible from the interest of consumption. Questions of law will continue as at present to be matters for the courts. Here Mr. Laski is far from enlightening. We take it, though, that what he objects to in the state as it is organized to-day is its out-grown legislative and administrative authority trying to perform functions and pretending to exercise powers which under existing conditions are far beyond its competence. To the state as final arbiter Mr. Laski seems to have no objection. He even looks with

favor upon a tribunal of "especial dignity like the Supreme Court of the United States," to settle disputes between conflicting interests and authorities. Yet, he tells us nothing of who is to make the law which the court is to administer, of what authority is to organize the court, and who is to enforce its decree.

Yet, it must be remembered that this book is not a systematic treatise upon the theory of the state. It is rather a series of studies, more or less related, upon what is perhaps the central problem of politics: the nature and limitations of state authority. The author elucidates his own position through an analysis of the theories of French philosophers of the post-revolutionary period. This part of Mr. Laski's work does the double service of helping to clarify his position and of acquainting an English speaking public with the thought of Bonald, Brunetière, Bourget, Lamennais and Royer-Collard.

To those of us who insist upon "solutions," Mr. Laski's volume will be disappointing. He doesn't build a utopia, he studies a problem. The process of government to-day is the process of the adjustment of various group interests. The representative legislature, in fact, promulgates as the law of the state the demands of those groups which are able to exert strong enough pressure upon it. The modern state is the organ of the dominant group in society. Its function, we are told, is to maintain "law and order." To the dominant group "order" is the existing order, and law is an instrument to maintain the *status quo*, rather than a method by which to effect progressive change. "To make the state omniscient is to leave it at the mercy of any group that is powerful enough to exploit it, . . . is to make it the creature of those who can possess themselves of its instruments" (p. 385).

Mr. Laski seeks the solution of his problem through the limitation of state authority on the one hand, and the allowing of a great measure of autonomy to social and functional groups on the other. The state will be recognized as one group within society, performing certain specific functions. Its importance, as compared with that of other groups, will be measured by the service it performs, rather than by the dignity which it claims.

STERLING D. SPERO.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Army Mental Tests: C. S. YOAKUM, and R. M. YERKES. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1920. Pp. 303.

This book puts into conveniently accessible form the methods for the examination of recruits employed by the Surgeon General's